DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 396 UD 014 583

AUTHOR	Gurwitz, Aaron S.
TITLE	Urban Schools and Equality of Educational Opportunity in New Jersey: A Report of the New Jersey Education Reform Project.
INSTITUTION	Greater Newark Urban Coalition, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	National Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	26p.
AVAILABLE FROM	New Jersey Education Reform Project, Greater Newark Urban Coalition, 24 Commerce Street, Newark, New Jersey 07102 (Price not quoted)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Change; *Educational Finance; Educational Needs; *Educational Opportunities; Ethnic Groups; Public Policy; Racial Differences; School Districts; School District Spending; Socioeconomic Status; *State Surveys; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New Jersey

ABSTRACT

New Jersey's current performance and the likely effects of various reform proposals were evaluated according to the degree that the following goal was attained: that no group of children, distintuishable by race, sex, locality, ethnic background, religion or economic status, shall consistently perform below the State average on measurements of specific skills. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that when we define equality of opportunity in this way equal expenditures do not necessarily insure equality of opportunity across school districts, and that even after fiscal capacity for schools is equalized, those districts which have the greatest needs for above average expenditures, are least able to raise additional revenues through local taxation. New Jersey's Educational Assessment Program of 1972-73 revealed that urban districts were performing significantly worse than the State average in all academic fields tested. This deficiency is not the result of lower expenditures in the cities. The problem is that there are much higher concentrations of children who are harder to educate in urban areas than in the State as a whole. Such children cannot achieve at the State average unless greater-than-average revenues are available for special educational programs. (Author/JM)

ED 097396

a report of

THE NEW JERSEY EDUCATION REFORM PROJECT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

URBAN SCHOOLS and EQUALITY of EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY in NEW JERSEY

by

Aaron S. Gurwitz
Stanford University
School of Education

ED 04[illegible]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Assessment of Educational Outcomes of Urban Schools	3
Extra Cost Factors of Urban Schools	4
Urban Fiscal Capacity and Municipal Overburden	9
Evaluation of Current Proposals	10
Summary and Conclusions	12
Appendix A: Sources of Data	14
Appendix B: Tables	15

INTRODUCTION

Up to the present, most of the discussions and reform proposals generated by Robinson vs. Cahill have focused on one issue, the inequalities of fiscal capacity and per pupil expenditures among New Jersey school districts. The idea has been to insure thoroughness and efficiency by making certain that equal tax effort will raise equal school revenues in almost all districts. It has been assumed that by providing this sort of equity, the State will have fulfilled its responsibility to insure that all children will have equal educational opportunity.

The reforms under discussion are without any question very important steps toward equality of opportunity, and they are required by the court decision. But they do not go all the way. Governor Byrne's proposal recognizes that mere equalization of expenditures is insufficient to guarantee equality of opportunity. The proposal includes provision for additional State aid to districts with high proportions of disadvantaged children. It is not clear, however, whether the amount suggested in consideration of "extra cost factors" will be sufficient to insure thoroughness and efficiency.

It is clear that all of the current reform packages suffer from the absence of a specific definition of what equality of opportunity might be. At a June 1974 seminar entitled "Toward a Thorough and Efficient Education" sponsored by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N. J., the group of assembled experts concluded that the Court had five specific items in mind when it spoke of equality of opportunity:

> "The court interpreted this responsibility to have at least five meanings: (1) There must be equal educational opportunities for children everywhere in the state, regardless of the school district in which they happen to live. (2) The opportunities must keep pace with the changing demands of the times. (3) Equality of opportunities must be expressed, at least in part, in equality of outcomes -- ie., of measured student performances or capabilities. The only outcomes explicitly mentioned in the Supreme Court decision were those associated with "that educational opportunity which is needed in a contemporary setting to equip the child in his role as a citizen and as a competitor in the labor market."

> (4) Outcomes must be equal at a relatively high level, not one that is merely minimal or adequate, though not necessarily one that would result from the "best" kind of education that could be provided. (5) The State must establish a mechanism for determining whether the students in each district are reaching high levels of outcomes and for taking appropriate action in those cases where they are not....."

These diverse, but interrelated, meanings can be conveniently summarized into the goal statement which we will use to evaluate New Jersey's current performance and the likely effects of various reform proposals.

> That no group of children, distinguishable by race, sex, locality, ethnic background, religion or economic status, shall consistently perform below the State average on measurements of specific skills.

The purpose of this paper will be to demonstrate that when we define equality of opportunity in this way equal expenditures do not necessarily insure equality of opportunity across school districts, and that even after fiscal capacity for schools is equalized, those districts which have the greatest needs for above average expenditures, are least able to raise additional revenues through local taxation.

ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF URBAN SCHOOLS

The report of New Jersey's Educational Assessment Program for 1972-73 makes it clear that the State is very far from achieving the goal of equality of educational opportunity, as defined above. The test results showed that students from urban areas were performing well below the State average in all areas. Average scores tell part of the story.* Fourth graders in the 14 New Jersey school districts with the highest number of economically disadvantaged children performed 24% below the State average on reading ability tests and 22.1% below the State average on mathematical ability tests. The equivalent figures for 12th graders were smaller (12.7% in reading and 14.7% in math), but the gap was still substantial. However, the averages do not tell the entire story. There were a total of 305 questions asked on all of the examinations administered (4th grade and 12th grade, reading and mathematics).** On only two of these did students from these 14 cities perform above the State average.

The conclusion is clear. Educational outcomes are poorer in urban areas than in the State as a whole, and since educational performance is associated with economic success in later life, the urban child is not being equipped "for his role as a citizen and as a competitor in the labor market."

So far we have said nothing new. We have just "rediscovered" the State Supreme Court's conclusion that the current system was not "thorough and efficient." The next point is new. We found that current per pupil expenditures are not significantly different in the cities than in the State as a whole. Nor are there substantial differences between cities and other areas in the allocation of total expenditures among various budgetary categories.

The State average for per pupil current expenditures was $1112 in 1972-73. The average for 17 of New Jersey's central cities was $1116. In 1974-75 estimated budgeted expenditures were $1430 for the state compared to $1435 for the 17 urban districts. The differences are not statistically significant. Of course this is not to say that there are no wide disparities in per pupil expenditures among school districts. Even within the group of 17 cities, estimated per pupil expenditures for 1974-75 varied between a low of $1054 in Atlantic City to a high of $1799 in New Brunswick.***

---

* Scores represent the percentage of students answering a specific question correctly. Each question is designed to test a specific skill.

** See Chart I

*** See Chart II

EXTRA COST FACTORS OF URBAN SCHOOLS

The important point is that equal expenditures do not imply equal outcomes or equal educational opportunity. There must be something different about urban schools that results in smaller outputs given similar inputs. These differences are summarized in the term "extra cost factors".

Suppose we have a standardized reading achievement test, and we wish all students in our school to achieve a score of at least 75%. Some of our students will be able to score 75% on the first trial without any preparation. Very few resources will have to be devoted to preparing these students to take the test. But suppose we have some Spanish speaking students in the school. They will have to be taught to understand and speak English before they can be taught reading to prepare for the test. Somewhat greater resources will have to be spent on these students before they can achieve a score of 75%. Suppose that we also have some blind students. They will have to be taught to read braille; special books will have to be purchased and special teachers hired. Suppose we have a group of students who have never seen a book before or who don't understand why reading is important. It will be harder to prepare them for the test.

Now suppose we spend equal amounts on each child and that the amount we spend is just enough to insure that the "average" child will be able to get a grade of 75%. Then we shouldn't be surprised if we have a large number of students below 75%, of whom a disproportionate number would be Spanish speaking, blind and students who do not think reading is important.

This simple model describes the situation in New Jersey now. We are spending approximately equal amounts on urban and non-urban children but there are more children with special characteristics who require higher-than-average inputs in urban schools. It shouldn't be surprising, then, that urban districts do consistently worse on standardized tests than other groups.

Who are these groups of children and where are they located? We will discuss four different types of students, all of whom, for one reason or another, might have trouble achieving at average levels given only average resources. All four

types are much more heavily concentrated in urban areas than in the State as a whole. The four categories are: Handicapped - Spanish Speaking - Emotionally Disturbed - Economically Disadvantaged.

Most States, New Jersey included, make some special provision for pupils with a variety of physical and mental handicaps. Samuel Kirk, an expert in this field, has estimated that slightly more than 10% of the school age population suffers from one sort of handicap or another that requires special educational treatment.[1] However, according to figures collected in the State Education Department's Fall Survey of school districts for 1972-73, the State average for percentage of children participating in "special education" programs was only 1.8%.* It is not clear which specific handicaps are subsumed under this category, but the low figure does call into question the adequacy of New Jersey's effort in this field, although this is somewhat beside the point we are making in this paper. More central is the fact that the average participation in special education programs in 17 urban school districts was 2.8%, 55% higher than the State average.*

This higher incidence of handicaps in urban districts should not surprise us, because, as we shall see, there is a higher incidence of poverty in urban areas. Many mental handicaps are associated with maternal malnutrition and pre-natal care, both of which tend to be insufficient for poor people. Other handicaps are associated with poor nutrition and health care for young children. These too are associated with poverty.

The same story can be told about Spanish speaking students. They too are much more heavily concentrated in central cities than in the State as a whole. About 5.1% of the school children of the State have Spanish surnames, but a full 14.9% of the students of 17 urban districts are Spanish surnamed.** What is more, the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in Lau v. Nicholas will almost certainly require that greater resources be devoted to special programs for non-English speakers. If per-pupil expenditures in urban areas and non-urban areas still remain the same, while more resources are devoted to bilingual programs, less will remain available for "average" children or children with other special needs.

---

1 Kirst. S.A., Educating Exceptional Children, Houghton Mifflin, N.Y. 1972 p. 24

* See Chart III

** See Chart IV

Emotionally disturbed children absorb greater resources than children without emotional problems even if no special programs for the former appear on school district budget reports. Discipline problems require teacher's and administrators' time, and teacher morale declines when a great many children are "unreachable."

It is difficult to measure the incidence of emotional disturbance in school districts. We do know, however, that emotional disturbances are more likely to arise in families with one parent than in those with two.[2] Since in most single parent families it is the father who is absent, we have used census figures on the percentage of children ages six to seventeen from families with a female head of household. This type of family is much more heavily concentrated in urban areas than in the State as a whole. The State average is 5.6%, while the average for 17 cities is 25.1%.* If our assumptions are correct, urban schools have many more emotionally disturbed children than do their school districts in the State. But, as we have said, average per pupil expenditures are essentially the same in urban areas and the State as a whole. Clearly, this means that someone is being shortchanged.

Our final category, the economically disadvantaged, involves much more complex economic, social and philosophical issues than the other three. Poor children generally come from culturally deprived homes. Parents usually don't have the time or money to buy books and magazines, so the children tend to have less exposure to the value of reading. In large families with one parent, early verbal training may be neglected, and a child who is slow to learn to read will have difficulty in all other fields. These problems are compounded if Spanish or a non-standard dialect of English is the language used in the home.

America's commitment to equal educational opportunity through extra expenditures for the economically disadvantaged is reflected in federal law (Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I) and a variety of state laws (Florida, California, New Jersey, Colorado, Utah and many others). These programs have received mixed reviews. Some compensatory education programs in specific districts have been successful. The effects of many other programs have not been reflected in students' performance on standardized achievement tests. However, one way or another, New Jersey has the task of raising the educational output of the economically disadvantaged.

---

[2]See Jenkens, "Psychiatric Syndromes in Children and their Relation to Family Background," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36 (4), 1966

*See Chart IV

If compensatory education is chosen as the dominant method of bringing up the average, another problem arises: finding some ideal method of deciding how much special aid each district needs. If we use the number of people below a certain income level to decide how much aid is needed, we exclude those who are near poverty and whose needs may be just as great. If we use participation in welfare programs (AFDC), we exclude the working poor. Nevertheless, in order to compare the incidence of poverty in New Jersey cities with that of the State as a whole, we will present two different sets of figures.

Poverty Indicators *

Indicator	17 Cities Average	State Average
Percent of Total Enrollment in Compensatory Education Programs	10.9%	4.8%
Percent Population Ages 6 to 17 from families Below the Poverty Level	19.5	8.6

Source: Fourth Count Census, State Education Department Fall Survey, (1973).

It is clear from these figures that there are more than twice as many poor children in urban areas than in other types of localities. It should be remembered with regard to these figures, and indeed with regard to all the data presented in this paper, that the State average includes the figures for the 17 cities. If the urban areas were excluded from the state average the disparities between the cities and the rest of the State would be even greater.

It is useful at this point to compare several specific districts with the "average" district in the State in order to point out some of the divergence between need and expenditure.

*For more details, see Chart VI

Summary of Urban School Resources and Needs

District	Current Expenditure Per-Pupil 1972-73	Current Expenditure Per-Pupil 1974-75	% Handicapped	% Spanish Surnamed	% Female Head of Household	% Families below Poverty
State Average	$1,112	$1,430	1.8	5.1	5.6	8.6
17 Cities Average	1,116	1,435	2.8	14.9	25.1	19.5
Sample Districts						
Camden	894	1,212	4.3	16.6	33.2	27.9
Newark	1,220	1,700	3.2	15.5	34.2	28.7
Millburn	1,539	1,964	1.1	0.2	6.3	2.1

Although expenditures have gone up from 1972-73 to 1974-75 almost 30%, clearly, the money is not going where the need is greatest. In light of these figures it should not be surprising that the cities do significantly worse than the rest of the State on educational performance criteria.

So we have the following situation: Urban schools have much greater needs than schools in other parts of the State, but per-pupil expenditures are about the same in cities and in the State as a whole. The disparity between needs and expenditures is reflected in pupils' performance on standard tests. Now we must ask, why aren't the special needs of Urban students being met? The blame stands squarely on the current disproportionate reliance on locally raised revenues for education. Urban school districts are exerting greater-than-average tax effort merely to maintain average expenditures. The higher expenditures necessary to meet the special needs of urban education would require even higher tax rates, but higher rates would merely speed up the flight of commercial, industrial and middle-class residential property from the cities.

URBAN FISCAL CAPACITY AND MUNICIPAL OVERBURDEN

In many other States central cities have higher per-capita assessed valuation than neighboring communities. This is not the case in New Jersey. The seventeen urban cities have an average equalized valuation per-pupil of $37,610.* At the same time (October 1, 1973) the State average was $53,045. Given this lower valuation per-pupil the cities were forced to tax themselves at a higher-than-average rate in order to maintain an expenditure level on a par with the State average. In 1973 the school tax rate per $100 of assessed valuation averaged $2.03 for the State as a whole, but the equivalent figure for the cities was $2.45. In other words cities had to tax themselves 20.7% above the State average in order to maintain average expenditures.* It is interesting to note that in 1974-75 it is anticipated that the school tax rate for the 17 urban districts will be $2.31 or 22% higher than the state average.

This picture would be explanation enough for the failure of the cities to raise the greater-than-average revenues their children need, but there are additional factors which constrain the cities' ability to support higher school expenditures. These factors are summarized in the term municipal overburden. This term describes the greater need for government services experienced by cities. Denser populations are associated with higher crime rates, greater sanitation problems, more frequent fires and so on. Since most local government revenue is derived from property taxes, these special urban problems further raise city tax rates relative to other areas of the State. The next several paragraphs will provide a more detailed delineation of this problem for New Jersey's cities.

In fiscal year 1972-73, New Jersey municipalities spent an average of $142.80 per-capita on non-educational local government services. The equivalent figure for 17 cities was $180.02, or 26% more.** These extra dollars were not spent on such "luxuries" as parks and libraries, but on essential services such as public safety and health and welfare. The following figures tell part of the story.

---

* See Chart VII
** See Chart VIII

Per-Capita Municipal Expenditure by Budgetary Category
(1972-73)

Category	17 Cities Average	State Average
General Government	$35.09	$20.31
Judiciary	1.80	1.45
Public Safety	80.01	50.24
Health & Welfare	10.98	5.99
Statutory Expenditure	22.24	13.37
Capital Improvements	2.53	7.17
State & Federal Aid	48.80	15.60

No Significant Difference in

Recreation & Conservation
Public Works
Non-school Educational (libraries)

Source: N.J. Department of Community Affairs, Thirty Fifth Annual Report of the Division of Local Government Services.

These additional needs for public service and the lower-than-average assessed valuation per-capita combine to raise the average total local tax rate for cities considerably above the State average. The State average total local tax rate was $3.46 per $100 of assessed valuation in 1972-73. The average for 17 cities was $5.23 --- more than 50% higher.* By 1974-75, this situation had worsened. It is anticipated that the overall tax rate for the 17 urban districts will be $5.38, 64% higher than the state average of $3.28. In light of these figures it is clear that it would be unreasonable to insist that the cities be required to raise the additional revenues necessary to insure that the goal stated in the beginning of this paper is met.

EVALUATION OF CURRENT PROPOSALS

Now we must ask whether systems like those presently under discussion would insure that sufficient revenues were available to urban schools. The Governor's proposal sets a minimum effective equalized valuation per pupil of $106,000 for districts with per pupil expenditures under the 65th percentile for the State (about $1,500 this year.) Expenditures above that level would have to be raised without State assistance.

* See Chart VIII

In addition, the "excess costs" of educating handicapped, vocational and bilingual students and children from disadvantaged families would be paid by the State. Now it might be that the amount budgeted by the State as allowance for "extra costs" would be enough to insure the attainment of the goal stated earlier in this report. But it might also be that the budgeted amount would be insufficient. It might also be that expenditures at the 65th percentile ($1500) would be sufficient to insure attainment of the goal. But it might also be insufficient. If both are insufficient, then the additional revenues required will have to be provided by the State or raised locally.

Suppose most of the money must come from the local district. Then urban districts will either have to spend more than the 65th percentile or continue to fail to meet the needs of their children. If they choose to spend more than the State average, they will have to tax themselves at more than the State average, and the pressure forcing businesses and middle-class residents out of the central cities will continue. Property values in the cities will continue to decline. Inasmuch as state aid is based upon the excess of the state property guarantee over the actual local property wealth, if urban property wealth declines, the State will have to pay a larger and larger share of urban school expenditures.

One of the current proposals for alleviating municipal overburden is that the State assume all welfare and judiciary costs. However, these are not the major categories of urban municipal budgets. Both categories are largely provided for at the county level. State assumption of these categories might lead to a reduction of county property tax, but would not significantly improve the relative position of the cities when compared with neighboring suburban areas, inasmuch as only about 10% of the local expenditure disparity is accounted for by county expenditures. One reason that the cities are unable to raise their property tax rates is that if they do, they will lose valuable commerce and industry to neighboring areas. The county expenditure elements of the current proposal do not deal with this problem.

An additional element of the "municipal overburden" package will certainly help the cities somewhat. It is proposed that the State pay localities the amount of property tax revenue assessed on most State owned land and facilities within each jurisdiction. In addition the State would make up the difference between State mandated tax abatement and full taxes on subsidized housing. Neverthless, 64% of the proposed munici-

pal aid will cover county expenditures, while only 36% will go for local municipal expenses, even though the bulk of the non-school tax rate variance is due to the local municipal expenses. It is not yet certain to what extent this will significantly alleviate the central problem, that is the difference between tax rates in urban areas and in the surrounding suburbs.

So the State cannot meet the "thorough and efficient" criterion merely by equalizing per-pupil valuation at some high level or with some relatively low level of extra funding for districts with many poor children. It is not clear how much money is needed to move toward equality of educational opportunity at a respectable rate, but it is clear that the districts where the need is greatest -- the urban districts -- are least capable of raising the additional revenue on their own.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

New Jersey's Educational Assessment Program of 1972-73 revealed that urban districts were performing significantly worse than the State average in all academic fields tested. This deficiency is not the result of lower expenditures in the cities. In fact urban districts and non-urban districts spend approximately the same amounts per pupil. The problem is that there are much higher concentrations of children who are harder to educate in urban areas than in the State as a whole. Cities have higher proportions of handicapped students, Spanish speaking students, emotionally disturbed students and economically disadvantaged students. Such groups cannot achieve at the State average unless greater-than-average revenues are available for special educational programs.

Urban areas have not been able to raise these greater-than-average revenues because they have smaller fiscal capacities than the State average, and they have much greater needs for non-school local government services than do other communities. For these reasons, total local tax rates in the 17 central cities will average more than 60% higher than the State average in 1974-75. Cities cannot raise their tax rates further because if they do they will speed up the flight of businesses and middle class residents to non-urban areas.

The State cannot assure that all children will be provided with equal educational opportunity merely by equalizing fiscal capacity across all school districts. Urban children have greater needs, and if these needs are to be met solely with local funds, the cities will be faced with an impossible choice. They will either be forced to raise their taxes even further above the State average, thus forcing businesses and residents out of the cities, or they will continue to fail to meet the educational needs of their children.

A thorough and efficient system of school finance ought to include explicit and specific assurance that the special needs of each group of students will be met. Commitment to the goal suggested in the beginning of this paper would be a good way to begin. The next step would be to design administrative and financial procedures to insure that progress toward that goal is steady and rapid.

APPENDIX A

Sources of Data

A. Student Characteristics

New Jersey Department of Education Fall Survey 1972

B. District Characteristics

New Jersey Education Association

"Basic Statistical Data," (1973)

"New Jersey Teacher Salaries," (1972-73)

New Jersey State Department of Education

Twenty First Annual Report of the Commissioner (1972)

C. Local Government Capacity Expenditure and Effort

N.J. Department of Community Affairs Thirty Fifth Annual Report of the Division of Local Government Services (1972)

N.J.E.A. Basic Statistical Data (1971-72) (1972-73)

D. Performance of Urban Schools: Educational Assessment Program State Report, 1974.

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Chart I: Average Percentage of Students Responding Correctly, New Jersey Educational Assessment Program Test, Taken in 1972-73.

Chart II: Current Expenses Per ADE

Chart III: Percentage of Pupils in Special Education Programs, Fall 1972

Chart IV: Percentage Spanish Surnamed Pupils, Fall 1972

Chart V: Proportion of Children Ages 6-17 with Female Heads of Household

Chart VI: Percentage of Total Enrollment in Compensatory Education Programs and Percent of Population Ages 6-17 below Poverty Level

Chart VII: Equalized Valuation and Tax Rates (1972-73)

Chart VIII: Total Municipal and County Expenditures (1972-73)

CHART I

Average Percentage of Students Responding Correctly
New Jersey Educational Assessment Program Test, Taken in 1972-73

Cluster	14 Cities*	State
Level 4		
Reading		
Phonetic Analysis	62.2%	79.0
Word Structure	60.5	74.3
Word Knowledge	50.6	71.6
Comprehension	41.5	57.3
Study Skills	56.0	74.2
Average	54.2	71.3
Mathematics		
Addition & Subtraction	66.3	79.5
Multiplication & Division	43.7	57.0
Measurement & Geometry	48.6	66.7
Problem Solving	55.6	73.6
Number Concepts	57.7	75.5
Number Sentences	57.7	69.4
Numeration	54.8	71.5
Average	54.9	70.5
Level 12		
Reading		
Context Clues	63.2	72.2
Main Idea	46.7	56.6
Supporting Detail	66.1	73.6
Inference	71.0	77.2
Application & Critical Reading	51.9	62.6
Average	59.8	68.4
Mathematics		
Computation with whole numbers	84.5	88.3
Computation with fractions	62.1	76.6
Computation with decimals	70.3	72.8
Computation with percent	57.6	66.0
Number Concepts	70.8	81.5
Problem Solving	48.3	61.1
Basic Algebra	45.3	62.7
Geometry and Measurement	43.7	56.9
Average	60.3	70.7

*Camden, Jersey City, Newark, Atlantic City, Trenton, Paterson, Elizabeth, Passaic, Hoboken, East Orange, New Brunswick, Perth Amboy, Plainfield, Vineland.

Source: Educational Assessment Program, State Report, 1974

CHART II

Current Expenses Per ADE

NJSBA Urban School Boards Committee	Actual 1972-73		Budgeted 1974-75	
ATLANTIC CITY	$ 869		$1,054	
ASBURY PARK	1,299		1,698	
BAYONNE	1,108		1,276	
CAMDEN	894		1,212	
EAST ORANGE	1,208		1,637	
ELIZABETH	1,153		1,472	
HOBOKEN	998		1,322	
JERSEY CITY	1,001		1,311	
LONG BRANCH	1,197		1,566	
NEWARK	1,220		1,700	
NEW BRUNSWICK	1,437		1,799	
ORANGE	1,289		1,733	
PASSAIC	1,004		1,204	
PERTH AMBOY	1,068		1,403	
PATERSON	920		1,113	
PLAINFIELD	1,204		1,510	
TRENTON	1,101		1,379	
GROUP AVERAGE		$1,116		$1,435
STATE AVERAGE		1,112		1,430
Selected Non-Central Cities				
IRVINGTON	1,061		1,349	
CLIFTON	1,039		1,235	
KEARNY	1,106		1,358	
NORTH BERGEN	973		1,190	
UNION CITY	1,076		1,402	
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs				
WILLINGBORO	949		1,214	
WALDWICK BORO	1,148		1,443	
GLEN RIDGE	1,262		1,666	
Selected Wealthy Suburbs				
MILLBURN	1,539		1,964	
UNION TOWNSHIP	1,146		1,348	
WOODRIDGE	1,257		1,531	
Selected Rural and Semi-Rural				
CLAYTON	874		1,118	
DELAWARE VALLEY REG. H.S.	1,524		N/A	
ALEXANDRIA	907		1,390	
FRENCHTOWN	963		1,132	
HOLLAND	1,156		1,498	
KINGWOOD	878		1,146	
MILFORD	1,293		1,579	
MONMOUTH REG. H.S.	1,625		N/A	
EATONTOWN	971		1,223	
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS	1,134		1,439	

Source: NJEA Research, Basic Statistical Data, 1973 & 1974 Editions, Present and Proposed Appointment to New Jersey School Districts 5/15/74

CHART III

Percentage of Pupils in Special Education Programs
Fall 1972

NJSBA		
ATLANTIC CITY	4.1	
ASBURY PARK	2.0	
BAYONNE	1.9	
CAMDEN	4.3	
EAST ORANGE	1.7	
ELIZABETH	3.0	
HOBOKEN	2.7	
JERSEY CITY	2.1	
LONG BRANCH	3.1	
NEWARK	3.2	
NEW BRUNSWICK	3.4	
ORANGE	2.6	
PASSAIC	2.1	
PERTH AMBOY	2.8	
PATERSON	2.1	
PLAINFIELD	3.0	
TRENTON	2.7	
GROUP AVERAGE		2.8
STATE AVERAGE		1.8
Selected Non-Central Cities		
IRVINGTON	2.1	
CLIFTON	1.5	
KEARNY	1.2	
NORTH BERGEN	0.7	
UNION CITY	1.6	
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs		
WILLINGBORO	1.1	
WALDWICK BORO	0.6	
GLEN RIDGE	0.4	
Selected Wealthy Suburbs		
MILLBURN	1.1	
UNION TOWNSHIP	1.2	
WOODRIDGE	3.5	
Selected Rural and Semi-Rural		
CLAYTON	2.5	
DELAWARE VALLEY REG. H.S.	0	
ALEXANDRIA	1.3	
FRENCHTOWN	8.1	
HOLLAND	1.5	
KINGWOOD	0	
MILFORD	0	
MONMOUTH REG. H.S.	1.0	
EATONTOWN	0.7	
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS	2.0	

Source: N.J. State Education Department, Fall Survey, 1973

CHART IV

Percentage Spanish Surnamed Pupils, Fall 1972

NJSBA		
ATLANTIC CITY	6.1	
ASBURY PARK	6.6	
BAYONNE	5.0	
CAMDEN	16.6	
EAST ORANGE	1.0	
ELIZABETH	19.8	
HOBOKEN	57.8	
JERSEY CITY	18.0	
LONG BRANCH	10.4	
NEWARK	15.5	
NEW BRUNSWICK	12.2	
ORANGE	2.3	
PASSAIC	31.7	
PERTH AMBOY	--	
PATERSON	23.5	
PLAINFIELD	3.5	
TRENTON	8.9	
GROUP AVERAGE		14.9
STATE AVERAGE		5.1
Selected Non-Central Cities		
IRVINGTON	6.8	
CLIFTON	1.0	
KEARNY	2.2	
NORTH BERGEN	11.5	
UNION CITY	63.9	
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs		
WILLINGBORO	1.4	
WALDWICK BORO	.6	
GLEN RIDGE	.4	
Selected Wealthy Suburbs		
MILLBURN	.2	
UNION TOWNSHIP	.4	
WOODRIDGE	.9	
Selected Rural and Semi-Rural		
CLAYTON	1.4	
DELAWARE VALLEY REG. H.S.	0	
ALEXANDRIA	0	
FRENCHTOWN	0	
HOLLAND	0	
KINGWOOD	0	
MILFORD	0	
MONMOUTH REG. H.S.	1.3	
EATONTOWN	3.1	
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS	0.6	

Source: N.J. State Education Department, Fall Survey, 1973

CHART V

Proportion of Children Ages 6-17 with Female Heads of Household

NJSBA		
ATLANTIC CITY	39.5%	
ASBURY PARK	39.5	
BAYONNE	15.1	
CAMDEN	33.2	
EAST ORANGE	26.2	
ELIZABETH	16.7	
HOBOKEN	21.0	
JERSEY CITY	21.6	
LONG BRANCH	24.6	
NEWARK	34.2	
NEW BRUNSWICK	23.0	
ORANGE	26.0	
PASSAIC	21.4	
PERTH AMBOY	14.3	
PATERSON	25.8	
PLAINFIELD	17.7	
TRENTON	26.4	
GROUP AVERAGE		25.1
STATE AVERAGE		5.6
Selected Non-Central Cities		
IRVINGTON	12.7	
CLIFTON	6.4	
KEARNY	10.0	
NORTH BERGEN	9.0	
UNION CITY	12.5	
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs		
WILLINGBORO	6.5	
WALDWICK BORO	5.3	
GLEN RIDGE	4.6	
Selected Wealthy Suburbs		
MILLBURN	6.3	
UNION TOWNSHIP	7.2	
WOODRIDGE	5.8	
Selected Rural and Semi-Rural		
CLAYTON	18.5	
DELAWARE VALLEY REG. H.S.	--	
ALEXANDRIA	6.4	
FRENCHTOWN	5.0	
HOLLAND	4.3	
KINGWOOD	9.6	
MILFORD	0	
MONMOUTH REG. H.S.	--	
EATONTOWN	10.4	
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS	9.2	

Source: Fourth Court U.S. Census, 1970

CHART VI

Percentage of Total Enrollment in Compensatory Education Programs and Percent of Population Ages 6-17 below Poverty Level

NJSBA Urban School Boards Committee	% Total Enrollment in Compensatory Education	% Pop. Ages 6-17 Below Poverty Level
ATLANTIC CITY	6.0	26.6
ASBURY PARK	1.5	29.9
BAYONNE	2.1	12.3
CAMDEN	8.8	27.9
EAST ORANGE	2.6	13.8
ELIZABETH	7.9	14.7
HOBOKEN	23.5	30.2
JERSEY CITY	9.2	17.4
LONG BRANCH	4.0	14.6
NEWARK	20.7	28.7
NEW BRUNSWICK	27.5	14.8
ORANGE	21.7	18.5
PASSAIC	7.7	15.8
PERTY AMBOY	7.8	12.8
PATERSON	12.1	21.0
PLAINFIELD	12.6	10.9
TRENTON	9.2	21.2
Selected Non-Central Cities		
IRVINGTON	8.9	8.0
CLIFTON	.3	2.8
KEARNY	1.2	4.7
NORTH BERGEN	.4	6.8
UNION CITY	5.3	12.7
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs		
WILLINGBORO	.3	6.1
WALDWICK BORO	0	2.4
GLEN RIDGE	0	3.6
Selected Wealthy Suburbs		
MILLBURN	0	2.1
UNION TOWNSHIP	6.3	4.0
WOODRIDGE	.2	3.2
Selected Rural and Semi-Rural		
CLAYTON	7.6	14.0
DELAWARE VALLEY REG. H.S.	0	--
ALEXANDRIA	?	4.4
FRENCHTOWN	0	5.8
HOLLAND	0	7.3
KINGWOOD	N/A	N/A
MILFORD	0	0
MONMOUTH REG. H.S.	?	--
EATONTOWN	13.8	7.8
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS	9.0	6.3

Sources: N.J. State Education Department, Fall Survey, 1973
Fourth Court U.S. Census, 1970

CHART VII

Equalized Valuation and Tax Rates, 1972-73

	Equalized Assessed Valuation Per Pupil 10/73		1972-73 School Tax Rate Per $100 of Val.		1972-73 Non-School Tax Rate Per $100 of Val.	
NJSBA						
ATLANTIC CITY	$43,634		$1.58		$3.46	
ASBURY PARK	33,298		3.15		2.79	
BAYONNE	56,348		1.77		2.94	
CAMDEN	18,042		2.29		3.66	
EAST ORANGE	36,745		3.13		4.23	
ELIZABETH	54,424		2.10		1.97	
HOBOKEN	23,464		2.53		4.45	
JERSEY CITY	30,059		2.67		2.97	
LONG BRANCH	39,956		2.72		1.49	
NEWARK	20,843		3.55		2.92	
NEW BRUNSWICK	65,322		1.89		1.32	
ORANGE	39,363		3.11		4.11	
PASSAIC	38,209		1.95		1.59	
PERTH AMBOY	50,657		1.80		1.33	
PATERSON	27,072		2.19		2.27	
PLAINFIELD	38,631		2.77		2.09	
TRENTON	23,308		2.48		3.64	
GROUP AVERAGE		37,610		2.45		2.78
STATE AVERAGE		53,045		2.03		1.43
Selected Non-Central Cities						
IRVINGTON	48,712		2.13		3.10	
CLIFTON	98,717		1.04		1.10	
KEARNY	88,213		1.38		1.30	
NORTH BERGEN	68,960		1.52		2.71	
UNION CITY	30,034		2.92		4.15	
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs						
WILLINGBORO	22,129		2.72		1.09	
WALDWICK BORO	44,475		2.94		1.65	
GLEN RIDGE	42,286		3.52		2.75	
Selected Wealthy Suburbs						
MILLBURN	118,842		1.47		1.78	
UNION TOWNSHIP	102,989		1.13		1.07	
WOODRIDGE	108,122		1.12		0.68	
Selected Rural & Semi-Rural						
CLAYTON	28,328		2.57		1.18	
ALEXANDRIA	45,771		2.76		0.78	
FRENCHTOWN	49,735		2.50		1.05	
HOLLAND	56,299		1.20		0.53	
MILFORD	62,538		1.70		0.48	
EATONTOWN	37,974		1.60		1.31	
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS	40,132		3.26		1.39	
KINGWOOD	65,282		1.87		0.99	

Source: NJEA, Basic Statistical Data 1973 Edition
Present and Proposed Apportionment to New Jersey School Districts 5/15/74

CHART VIII

Total Municipal and County Expenditures, 1972-73

MSBA	MUNICIPAL		COUNTY		TOTAL	
ATLANTIC CITY	412.11		77.65		489.76	
ASBURY PARK	182.58		59.57		242.15	
BAYONNE	171.03		89.09		260.12	
CAMDEN	138.78		75.30		214.08	
EAST ORANGE	189.12		114.36		303.48	
ELIZABETH	164.68		73.90		238.58	
HOBOKEN	141.65		89.09		230.74	
JERSEY CITY	181.68		89.09		270.77	
LONG BRANCH	114.08		59.57		173.65	
NEWARK	281.54		114.36		395.90	
NEW BRUNSWICK	153.42		63.27		216.62	
ORANGE	187.56		114.36		301.92	
PASSAIC	132.80		76.25		209.05	
PERTH AMBOY	184.88		63.27		248.15	
PATERSON	121.14		76.25		197.39	
PLAINFIELD	166.41		73.90		240.31	
TRENTON	136.16		81.64		217.80	
GROUP AVERAGE		180.02		82.35		262.37
STATE AVERAGE		142.80		78.14		220.94
Selected Non-Central Cities						
IRVINGTON	160.14		114.36		274.50	
CLIFTON	131.02		76.25		207.27	
KEARNY	213.52		89.09		302.60	
NORTH BERGEN	162.25		89.09		251.34	
UNION CITY	136.64		89.09		225.73	
Selected Non-Wealthy Suburbs						
WILLINGBORO	62.77		46.20		108.97	
WALDWICK BORO	144.02		70.27		214.29	
GLEN RIDGE	182.57		114.36		296.93	
Selected Wealthy Suburbs						
MILLBURN	239.13		114.36		353.49	
UNION TOWNSHIP	143.25		73.90		217.15	
WOODRIDGE	129.81		70.27		200.08	
Selected Rural and Semi-Rural						
CLAYTON	68.66		45.80		114.46	
ALEXANDRIA	72.86		65.70		138.56	
FRENCHTOWN	97.23		65.70		162.93	
HOLLAND	77.22		65.70		142.92	
KINGWOOD	93.69		65.70		159.39	
MILFORD	248.41		65.70		314.11	
EATONTOWN	95.08		59.57		154.65	
TINTON FALLS SCHOOLS*	97.02		59.57		156.59	

* Including New Shrewsbury and Shrewsbury Township.

Source: New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Thirty Fifth Annual Report of the Division of Local Government Services

Bibliography

Berke, J.S. and J.G. Sinken, "Paying for New Jersey's Schools, Problems and Proposals", New Jersey Education Reform Project of the Greater Newark Urban Coalition, Newark, 1974 (mimeo).

Brazur, H. et.al., "Fiscal Needs and Resources: A Report to the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education", 1971 (mimeo).

Callahan, J.J., Wilken and Sillerman, "Urban Schools and School Finance Reform," The National Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C., 1974.

Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coons, Clune and Sugarman, Private Wealth and Public Education, Belknop, Cambridge, 1970.

Fantini, M. and G. Weinsten, "Making Urban Schools Work", Holt, New York, 1968.

Guthrie, Kleindorfer, Levin and Stout, Schools and Inequality, MIT Press, Cambridge, 1971.

Jenkens, L., "Psychiatric Syndromes in Children and Their Relation to Family Background", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36 (4), 1966.

Kirk, Samuel A., Educating Exceptional Children, Houghton Mifflin, Co., New York, 1972.

McCloskey, E.F., Urban Disadvantaged Pupils, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, 1967.

New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in New York State, The Fleischman Report, Viking Press, New York, 1973.

Passow, Urban Education in the 1970's, Teachers College Press, New York, 1971.

Potomac Institute, The, "Equity for Cities in School Finance Reform", The Potomac Institute, Washington, D.C., 1973.

State of Florida, Improving Education in Florida, Governor's Citizens Committee on Education, Tallahassee, 1973.

State of New Jersey, Department of Community Affairs, Thirty-Fifth Annual Report of the Division of Local Government Services, Trenton, 1972.

State of New Jersey Department of Education, Educational Assessment Program State Report, 1972-73, Trenton, 1974.

State of New Jersey Department of Education, Twenty-first Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, Trenton, 1972.

The New Jersey Education Reform Project
Greater Newark Urban Coalition
24 Commerce Street
Newark, N. J. 07102 (201) 624-7475

Richard W. Roper - *Director*
Larry Rubin - *Research Director*